


Appl. No. 10/618,855  
Reply to Interview Summary of January 24, 2008  
Docket No.: 32157-101  
Statement of Substance of the Interview

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office and addressed to: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 22, 2008.

  
Jeannette Collymore

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Kevin Harrington	TC/A.U.:	3714
Appl. No.:	10/618,855	Examiner:	Cameron Saadat
Filed:	July 14, 2003	Confirmation No.:	3326
Docket No.:	32157-101 US	Customer No.:	26486
Title:	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR AUTOMATED BUILDING INCIDENT RESPONSE		

Re: Response to Interview Summary of January 24, 2008

BURNS & LEVINSON LLP  
(formerly PERKINS, SMITH & COHEN, LLP)  
125 Summer Street  
Boston, MA 02110-1624  
(617) 345-3000

TO: Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW**

Sir/Madam:

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.133, Applicant's representative, Kathleen Chapman, submits the following written statement of the substance of the telephonic interview conducted on January 16, 2008, between Applicant's representative and Examiner Cameron Saadat.

Claims discussed

1, 7, 10, and 12.

Prior Art discussed

Larsen, United States Patent # 7,134,088, issued on November 7, 2006, published on March 27, 2003, filed on July 3, 2002 (Larsen), and Pyle, United States Patent # 4,446,454, issued on May 1, 1984 (Pyle).

Outcome

With respect to claims 1, 7, and 10, Applicant's representative stated that Larsen does not disclose an information modifier as claimed because Larsen does not allow modification of existing data. Examiner stated that the claimed information modifier is described with functional language.

With respect to claim 12, Applicant's representative stated that Pyle fails to teach the claimed feature of a dispatcher capable of tasking the responding contacts. Examiner indicated that further consideration would be given to this argument. Examiner recommended amending claim 12 to provide a positive recitation of the tasking feature. No agreement was reached on patentability.


Conclusion

In accordance with Section 714.01 of the M.P.E.P., the following information is presented in the event that a call may be deemed desirable by the Examiner:

KATHLEEN CHAPMAN (617) 345-3210.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kevin Harrington, Applicant

Date: February 22, 2008

By:   
Kathleen Chapman  
Reg. No. 46,094  
Attorney for Applicants